

Date: November 3, 2015

Time: 10:00 am to 3:00 pm

Meeting: Public Availability Session

Subject: Proposed 2016 303(d) List and 2018 Listing Methodology Meeting Notes

Attendees:

Trish Rielly, MoDNR	trish.rielly@dnr.mo.gov
Robert Voss, MoDNR	robert.voss@dnr.mo.gov
Sam McCord, MoDNR	samuel.mccord@dnr.mo.gov
Bill Whipps, MoDNR	bill.whipps@dnr.mo.gov
Jane Davis, MoDNR	jane.davis@dnr.mo.gov
Mike Kruse, MoDNR	michael.kruse@dnr.mo.gov
John Hoke, MoDNR	john.hoke@dnr.mo.gov
John Madras, MoDNR	john.madras@dnr.mo.gov
Lynn Hooper, Boone County	lhooper@boonecountymmo.org
Trent Stober, HDR Engineering, Inc.	trent.stober@hdrinc.com
Nick Muenks, Geosyntec Consultants	nmuenks@geosyntec.com
Leslie Holloway, Missouri Farm Bureau	lholloway@mofb.com
Robert Brundage, Newman, Comley, & Ruth	rbrundage@ncrpc.com

The public availability session was set up as an informal public meeting to allow stakeholders the opportunity to provide comments or ask clarifying questions relating to the proposed 2016 303(d) List and the 2018 Listing Methodology Document (LMD).

Discussions occurred about specific streams that were assessed as impaired under the 1:100,000 scale NHD stream network expansion for dissolved oxygen, fish tissue, and E.coli. Many of the questions related to who collected the data, the purpose of the monitoring event, and whether the age and/or limited data set was representative of current water body conditions.

A question was raised, and discussion followed, regarding how a lower reach of Little Cedar Creek in Boone County (Waterbody ID: 0744) was listed as impaired in relation to the sampling point located some distance upstream. It was stated the upper reach of the stream, where the sampling point was located, may not be permanent flowing. Staff indicated that they would revisit the sampling location and data used to support the listing.

Discussions occurred regarding newly listed streams for which no recent (i.e., since the previous listing cycle) data were available, and what caused those streams to be listed during the 2016 listing cycle but not in previous cycles. For the streams of interest, the water quality assessment sheets were reviewed and staff indicated where available water quality data was available during the current listing cycle that was not available during the previous cycle. Staff also explained that list current and previous listings differed because information was either not provided previously or that the data was available after assessment of individual water bodies began.

HDR, Inc. suggested that clarifying statements be added to the proposed 2018 LMD as it related to the assessment of pH as a chronic water quality standard. The change in the assessment procedure relates to proposed clarification to the water quality standards that would describe pH as 4-day chronic criteria. Clarification was also provided by staff regarding how hardness samples are calculated when less than or greater than eight (8) samples are available. Participating stakeholders were asked to provide examples of preferred wording in advance of the biological workgroup meeting scheduled on November 18, 2015 so that the topics could be discussed further at that meeting.

Site-specific nutrient criteria for lakes were discussed. It was suggested that Table M - site specific numeric criteria for lakes, needs to be reviewed to determine if the data used in the development of the criteria was appropriate. Staff indicated that they would review the example given (i.e., Monsanto Lake, Water Body ID: 7301) and report back to stakeholders.

There were discussions relating to the collection and assessment of multiple discrete data points as compared to the use of (continuously recording) sonde data for dissolved oxygen. Some stakeholders questioned whether either method was more representative of instream conditions than the other, and whether sonde data should be summarized and interpreted during the assessment process (e.g. number of excursions below the criteria or average daily minimums) rather than treated identically to the discrete data.

Stakeholders provided suggestions to water quality assessment worksheets to help clarify information presented, such as, duplicate samples and/or corrections to narrative statements.

A stakeholder noted the Middle Fork Black River (water body ID: 2744) was delisted during the 2014 listing cycle, but then was added back to the 2016 303(d) list of impaired waters for the same pollutant pair. If relisted in error, the Middle Fork Black River will be removed from the proposed 2016 303(d) impaired waters list.

Other LMD comments were briefly discussed with regard to the weight-of-evidence approach, and the appropriateness of using methods for assessing small streams against candidate reference streams instead of the wadeable reference streams listed in water quality standards. Additional discussions can be continued at the biological workgroup meeting scheduled on November 18, 2015.

The department was complemented for providing transparency during the listing processes by providing access to the data, reports, and how data is assessed. The department was also commended for the addition of the 5-alt category, as part of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 303(d)/TMDL vision, to the listing methodology.

Throughout the meeting and in closing, stakeholders were asked to follow-up in writing with specific questions they would like to have addressed. By doing so, their questions and comments become part of the department's administrative record for these efforts.

The department will hold a second public availability session for the 2016 303(d) List and 2018 LMD on December 1, 2015. The public hearing for these documents is scheduled for January 6, 2016 and the public notice period will close on January 31, 2016.